ing every year. We have certain fixed rules for managing inland fisheries, and the rules are strictly followed. Our officers, because they are public servants, used to enquire and hear the complaints and set right the grievances. I am only very glad to do it. Yesterday a case was brought to my notice by Mr. Rama Ayyar. He told me that some people from Ayyampilli came to him and complained that the fishery contractors were not conducting their operation properly, and that they wanted to make a personal representation of their grievances to me. Certainly I am bound to hear them and do what I can to redress their grievances. I faithfully promised him that I would hear them this morning at 8-30. I studied the important papers connected with the same which I received from the Tahsildar, and I was awaiting them till 9-30. I heard just now from my Tahsildar that they propose to settle the matter between themselves, amicably. The partits are the last year s contractor and the present contractor. The Tahsildar reports that the matter will be settled by the 2nd of Dhanu and to-day the date is 29th Vrischigam. Only some 2 days more. I am thankful to the Member for Trippunittura for making a representation of the matter, not as a Member of the Council.

Deputy President.— I am not satisfied. It is not a matter of urgency; so I cannot allow the motion.

A Bill to amend the Cochin Chief Court Regulation II of 1076.

Deputy President.—Next item of business is moving for leave to introduce the following Bills :—

1. A Bill to amend the Cochin Chief Court Regulation II of 1076.

Mr. N. Padmanabha Menon.—May I know what was done with Mr. K. S. Rama Ayyar's adjournment motion ?

Dr. A. G. Menon.—That was refused and the other was withdrawn.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—I move for leave of the Council to introduce a Bill to amend the Cochin Chief Court Regulation II of 1076. In the Regulation there is a section that one of the three Judges of the Chief Court shall be a Christian. How it came to be inserted in the Regulation, I was not able to gather from the information available. I wanted to apply to the Government under Standing Order 72 for the back papers but thinking that if the Government supplies me with the papers it may be construed to be an attitude of the Government in support of my Bill and I wanted to avoid that contingency and I do not want to be called a "privileged Member", in the language which was used on a former occasion, about me in this House. (*Hear, hear*). I am sure the Government Members will be able

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

to explain how it came to be introduced and on this point the Member for Mulakunnattukavu, who is the source of all information, may perhaps be able to enlighten this House. Whatever that may be, there is no justification to retain such a provision in the Statute Book. On the ground of analogy it is impossible to support it. There is no such provision in Travancore, Pudukotta or Mysore. Then this Bill is only an application of a principle enunciated in another Bill for which leave of the House will be sought at present; I mean the "Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill." I am indebted to a large extent to the Member for Kunnamkulam for that opening sentence in the objects and reasons of his Bill which has been copied by me in full in my Bill. The opening sentence in that Bill is "That State is not the overlord of conscience and that a man must be free to choose his religious faith have been well recognised by all civilised nations." The same sentence has been borrowed and adopted by me in my objects and reasons. "That State is not the overlord of conscience and that a man must be free to choose his religious faith have been well recognised by all the civilised nations". So if the Caste and Religious Disabilities Removal Bill is to create union between the Hindus and other castes I suppose the same principle will apply in the case of my Bill and it is only right that nobody shall gain or lose by following any religion, and the charge that I am attempting to create disunion cannot therefore stand. And these are advanced days when even Palace roads have to be thrown open for all communities and there is no reason why any appointment should be reserved for any community. There is one school of thought that even the field of the choice of the partners in life of the Princes of Cochin is to be thrown open to all communities; if that principle is to be applied in the case of appointments, there is no reason to reserve any appointment for a particular community.

Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.—No reference shall be made to the Princes.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—No reference was made to any particular individual Prince.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—I never made any particular reference.

Dr. A. R. Menon.—What is the trouble here? There was no reference here whatever of a personal nature.

Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.—There is no trouble. Further, to work this Regulation the Government was practically in great difficulties. Except in one or two instances the Government had always to go in for men in the foreign service to fulfil this clause of this Regulation. Under these circumstances there

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

is no meaning in retaining such a provision and I move that leave may be given to introduce this Bill.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—I oppose the motion.

Mr. I. E. Ambooken.—Sir, it is not seconded.

Mr. C. A Ouseph.—It does not require any seconding.

Sir, in opposing the motion I shall not entangle myself with the matrimonial relations of the members of the Royal family. Such topics I shall leave for the mature deliberation of the Hon'ble Member for Jenmies.

It is indeed my misfortune to have to oppose this measure even at this stage. As any one else, I am conscious that it is desirable to set up a healthy practice of not opposing Bills when motions are made for leave to introduce them. But I do not think the Hon'ble Members would wish that privilege to be reduced into a license for Bills of a mischievous character and tendency as the one before the House is.

I quite agree with the idea expressed in the opening sentence of the objects and reasons for the Bill. "State is not the overlord of conscience and a man must be free to choose his religious faith." I would add a rider to it quite different from the Hon'ble Member's statement "that no person should be a gainer by reason of his religion and no office should be reserved to the follower of any religion." My rider is that no person should be placed at a disadvantage, no person should stand to lose, no person should be handicapped, by reason of his religion, in the matter of recruitment to the public services, whether the handicap or loss or disadvantage be the effect of a legal enactment or the result of persistent practice by individuals wielding governmental power. That governmental power, in the matter of recruitment to public services, has not been properly and fairly exercised in regard to the different classes in the State stands uncontradicted. The facts and figures that I have brought before the House regarding representation in the service have till this day stood uncontradicted. The same state of affairs for whose change large communities and their spokesmen in and outside the Council have been agitating have continued to exist. And if you would examine the Civil List you would find that the unhealthy practice complained of has something to do with the religious differences of the different communities in the State. Sir, as a counterpoise against the growing evils of this unhealthy practice reservations are made from time to time and the reservation now attempted to be removed is just such a counterpoise.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Such reservations are not a peculiar feature of the Chief Court Regulation. The very constitution which enabled us to meet here bristles with it. Every person is not a voter, the right to vote being made dependent upon certain property and educational qualifications. Special constituencies are provided based on religion, caste, property and profession. The very seat of the Hon'ble Member is such a reservation. For fear of treading upon unpleasant ground I do not wish to refer to reservation of very high positions under the Government whose justification is religion and religion alone.

The Christian Community in the State is responsible for nearly 28 per cent of its population. They are rich and are not backward in education. Adhering to a religion which is foreign to this part of the world they follow customs and manners peculiar to themselves which it may not be very easy for other religionists to appreciate or understand. The Chritsians have a past which is not quite irrelevant to this consideration. Powers more aggressive than the British, namely, the Portuguese and the Dutch, had taken the Christians of Cochin into their special protection, the civil and criminal jurisdiction over them being wielded by those powers. The Britisher's policy of trust in the indigenous Rulers placed the Christians under the Raja and the special protection and jurisdiction crystallized in course of time into a place reserved in the Chief Court for a Christian Judge.

Sir, it is pertinent to ask what is the necessity for the change proposed by the Hon'ble Member for Jenmies. Has the provision worked any mischief at any time? The only mischief it has worked out is that a Christian Judge has always sat in the Chief Court. May be, to those to whom the progress of the Christians is always an eyesore the sight might not have been quite pleasant.

The proposed amendment is mischievous in effect. Its justification is that the provision is not based on any principle. The principle that justifies the provision is that such reservations are necessary where practice never proceeds consistently with principle. Sir, we have all heard of principles and of their being preached from all corners. Even the very devil was quoting Scripture for his own ends. The objects and reasons of the Bill remind me of a great Champion of principles who had his *hay-day* during the war and made hay preaching principles.

Horatio Bottomby.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Deputy President.—The question before the House is whether leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Cochin Chief Court Regulation be granted.

(*The motion was put to the vote and carried by a majority.*)

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—I want a poll, Sir.

Deputy President.—Do you mean in earnest ?

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Yes, Sir.

Deputy President.—Those who voted for the Bill please stand up.

For.

1.	Mr. C. Achyuta Menon.	10.	Mr. N. Padmanabha Menon.
2.	Mr. Chakko Cheruvattur.	11.	Mr. K. S. Rama Ayyar.
3.	Dr. A. G. Menon.	12.	Mr. T. A. Ramachandra Ayyar.
4.	Mr. E. Ikkanda Wariar.	13.	Mr. M. K. Raman.
5.	Mr. C. N. Ittiravi Nambudiri.	14.	Mr. K. Raman Menon.
6.	Mr. M. Krishna Menon.	15.	Dr. A. R. Menon.
7.	Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.	16.	Mr. A. B. Salem.
8.	Srimati T. Madhavi Amma.	17.	Mr. K. Sankaran Nambudiri.
9.	Mr. K. T. Mathew.	18.	Mr. A. Sankara Puduval.

Against.

1.	Mr. I. E. Ambooken.	4.	Mr. O. R. Chummar.
2.	Mr. Lonappan Chakkola.	5.	Mr. C. A. Ouseph.
3.	Mr. George Chakyamuri.		

Neutrals.

1.	Mr. K. Achyuta Menon.	8.	Mr. K. Krishna Pisharoti.
2.	Mr. V.K. Aravindaksha Menon.	9.	Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.
3.	Mr. K. Govinda Menon.	10.	Mr. I. Raman Menon.
4.	Mr. K. P. Karuppan.	11.	Mr. Sheik Abdul Qadir Sahib Bahadur.
5.	Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.	12.	Mr. V. B. Vaidyanatha Ayyar.
6.	Mr. S. S. Koder.	13.	Mr. A. K. Vengu Ayyar.
7.	Mr. T. K. Krishna Menon.	14.	Diwan Bahadur Dr. V. Verghese.

Mr. C. A. Ouseph.—Mr. T. K. Krishna Menon also stood up. He may also be included.

Mr. T. K. Krishna Menon.—I always stand up whenever I am called up. I am very glad to vote. So far as we Government Members are concerned, we have no objection to give leave to introduce the Bill. (*Hear, hear.*) It has been the established custom of this House not to oppose any Bills brought forward by the non-official or the nominated Members.

Dr. A. G. Menon.—The custom came into existence after the introduction of my Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly